Date of Uploading 22 / 04 /2024

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting held on 04.04.2024 under the Chairmanship of Shri Santosh Kumar Sarangi, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No. 01AM25 held on 04.04.2024

The following members were present in the meeting:

1.	Shri S.B.S. Reddy	Addl. DGFT
2.	Shri AkashTaneja	Addl. DGFT
3.	Shri Anil Agarwal	Addl. DGFT
4.	Dr. S.K. Bansal	Addl. DGFT
5.	Shri Rakesh Kumar	Addl. DGFT
6.	Shri Lokesh H.D.	Addl. DGFT
7.	Shri RandheepThakur	Joint DGFT
8.	Shri K.V. Tirumala	Joint DGFT
9.	Shri K.M. Harilal	Joint DGFT

Following cases were discussed. The decisions taken on the individual cases are as under:-

Case No.	Name of the firm
1.	M/s Ralson (India) Limited, Ludhiana.
2.	M/s Shree Laxmi Udyog, Jalgaon.
3.	M/s Hindustan Apparel Industries , Mumbai.
4.	M/s Aspen Shaving Products, Telangana.
5.	M/s C.G. Galva India, Guwahati.
6.	M/s Richa Fashion (Rakhi Creations), {Bhanwarlal Choudhary, H.U.F.} Surat, Gujarat.
7.	M/s Vivid Global Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
8.	M/s United Poly Eng. Pvt Ltd. , Delhi.
9.	M/s VSVR Chems Private Limited, Chennai.
10.	M/s Theon Pharmaceuticals Ltd. , Haryana.
11.	M/s SMI Coated Products Pvt. Ltd. , Mumbai
12.	M/s SMI Coated Products Pvt. Ltd. , Mumbai
13.	M/s Mukka Proteins Ltd. , Karnataka
14.	M/s La-Gajjar Machineries Pvt. Ltd. , Ahmedabad.
15.	M/s Nikhil Adhesives Ltd., Mumbai.

16.	M/s Exide Industries Ltd., Kolkata.
17.	M/s PMR Mud Riggers India Pvt. Ltd., Pune
18.	M/s Arya Fash-Tex, Ahmedabad.
19.	M/s Genus Power Infrastructures Limited, Rajasthan
20.	M/s Kalp Impex , Jalgaon.
21.	M/s Ratna Nico Chem Pvt. Ltd. , Vadodara.
22.	M/s Sara Sae Pvt. Ltd., Dehradun.
23.	M/s Thermosol Glass Pvt. Ltd. , Ahmedabad
24.	M/s Balaji Heavy Lifters Pvt. Ltd. , Gujarat.
25.	M/s Ratnamani Metal and Tubes Ltd. , Ahmedabad.
26.	M/s Medreich Limited. , Bengaluru.
27.	M/s Prayag Polytech Pvt. Ltd. , Gurugram.
28.	M/s R R Kabel Ltd., Mumbai.
29.	M/s Kumar Brothers Co. Delhi.
30.	M/s Dhwani Polyprints Pvt. Ltd. ,Mumbai.
31.	M/s Dhwani Polyprints Pvt. Ltd. ,Mumbai.
32.	M/s Dhwani Polyprints Pvt. Ltd. ,Mumbai.
33.	M/s Dhwani Polyprints Pvt. Ltd. ,Mumbai.
34.	M/s Dhwani Polyprints Pvt. Ltd. ,Mumbai.
35.	M/s Sara Sai Pvt. Ltd., Dehradun. , Chennai.
36.	M/s Maxmed Life Sciences Private Limited, Delhi
37.	M/s ITC Limited., Chennai.
38.	M/s Padmini VNA Mechatronics Limited. Gurugram.
39.	M/s Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
40.	M/s Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
41.	M/s Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
42.	M/s Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
43.	M/s Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
44.	M/s Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
45.	M/s Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
46.	M/s Harimohan Agro Industries. , Jalgaon
47.	M/s Jawaharlal and sons, Indore, MP
48.	M/s Jawahar Exim Ltd. , Thane.
49.	M/s Thermosol Glass Private Limited , Ahmedabad
50.	M/s Thermosol Glass Private Limited, Ahmedabad

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 3011000864 dated 08.07.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are largest manufacture and exporter of bicycle tyres and tubes in India along with producers of 2 wheeler auto tyre and tubes and due to slow down of global market in recent, they had shortage of orders. Import item is Synthetic Rubber and other items. They were making efforts to complete export obligation with in validity but all in vain due to market recession globally. Hence they are requesting to allow six month EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3011000864 dated 08.07.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Ludhiana)

Case No.02 M/s. Shree Laxmi Udyog, Jalgaon.

F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00009123AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for removal of AU condition from the Import License No.0550001576 dated 28.08.2009

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that in view of minutes of Inter Ministerial Committee meeting dt. 29.04.2003 & PN. 47 dt. 18.05.2011 as well as order of Mumbai High Court dt. 21/05/2021 read with observation of Telangana High Court the request of removal of AU condition of license has complete merit. PRC has considered the said issue in its meeting no 21/AM 2022 dt 10-03-2022 and found merits in the contention based on several aspects including Minutes of Inter Ministerial Meeting dt 29-04-2003 and acceded to the request of the applicants Shah Nanji Nagsi Exports Pvt Ltd. Hence they are requesting to allow removal of AU condition from the Import License No. 0550001576 dated 28.08.2009.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.03 M/s Hindustan Apparel Industries, Mumbai.
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00008879AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310831097 dt. 20.08.2019

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they had imported fabric for the manufacturing of garments. They have obtained Advance Licence No 0310831097 dated 20.08.2019 from ADGFT Mumbai and fulfilled the exports obligation within the valid EO Period. Their import was valid upto 20.08.2020 and last import was done on 21.08.2020 & 07.09.2020 i.e. only one month beyond the validity of licence. This was done during peak Covid-19 period. RA has already rejected their request for revalidation. Hence they are requesting to allow one month revalidation against subject authorization for regularization purpose.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it was decided to allow revalidation for a further period of 1 month from the date of expiry of initial validity of Advance Authorisation No. 0310831097 dt. 20.08.2019. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No.04 M/s Aspen Shaving Products, Telangana.
F.No HQRPRCAPPLY0009075AM24
Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0910065834 dated 03.01.2018.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have taken Advance Authorization No.0910065834 Dt.03.01.2018 for export of blades and import of Cold Rolled Medium High Carbon Steel. This item was kept in Appendix 4J and EO Period was 6 Months. Subsequently this item was removed from 4J. As they have exported blades within 10 months from the date of import and request to extend EO by four months with nominal composition fee as notified by DGFT for 4J items. Hence they are requesting to allow four months EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and decided to allow EOP for the period of 4 months after expiry of initial EOP against advance authorization No. 0910065834 dated 03.01.2018 subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions. The other terms and conditions towards fulfilment of EO shall remain same as per policy/HBP provisions. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No.05 M/s C.G. Galva India, Guwahati.
F.No.01/60/162/414AM21/PRC
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Permission for re-export of uninstalled/sealed pack of imported machinery under EPCG License No.0530150416 dated 19.11.2009

This is a defer case of PRC Meeting No.31/AM24 held on 01.03.2024 (Case No.02) wherein Committee decided to defer the case for further details regarding the capital goods and extent of obsolescence of the technology and the modalities/details of export of the alternate item as requested by them would be called for further examination.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they had imported industrial plant & machinery for manufacturing of galvanizing and corrugated sheets in November, 2009 to setup the industry in the state of Assam under above EPCG. Before starting work on the project, they had discussion and consulted all applicable statutory provisions and prevalent policies as they are existence then, and based on those deliberations, they started working on this project based on eligible benefits like VAT, Transport exemption as per the policy of Government of Assam.

The Firm had imported capital goods in 2009 for manufacturing of galvanised sheets in the state of Assam. The Capital Goods was imported under EPCG Scheme of Govt. of India. The Firm had export obligation for Rs. 14 cr. apx. (U$ 3.09 Mio) in 6 years. Assam state was selected for this manufacturing facility because of various incentives and benefits like: Capital Subsidy @ 30% of capital investment. Sales Tax (VAT) exempted for 10 years on domestic sale; Transport subsidy for 10 years; Interest subsidy for 10 years; Income Tax Holiday for 10 years. As soon as importing of Capital Goods, Government of Assam made the existing benefits/incentives ineligible with retrospective effect from 1 st October 2008.

Accordingly their project became uneconomical and financially unviable due to withdrawal of several incentives. They had imported capital goods under EPCG scheme with good intentions for starting the production in the state of Assam but it could not happened of because change of Government policy with retrospective effect and unfortunately it was published even before clearing of capital goods from the port. The product was put in negative list by the State Government. They could not start the project because of this sudden change. Hence they are requesting to allow permission for re-export of uninstalled/sealed pack machinery back to supplier against payment within 6 months.

We had given various presentation of Government of Assam in expectation of relief because it was major change in policy without discussing the industry. Whole industry in the state was put in stress and difficulties because of this sudden announcement. The notification dated 3rd November 2009 was again maintained by new notification dated 29th April 2015. We couldn't even start the production because of this notification. Plant even couldn't installed. Finally, when our all efforts with state government didn't produce positive results which took lot of time and efforts, we started to our correspondence and representations to DGFT. We presented the case to DGFT after revised notification of Government of Assam in April 2015. We were not allowed for re-export in Aug 2015 and Feb 2016 .

Present Status: • The capital goods is there at site as it is after import and same was not installed. • It was not installed so far because of change in policy of state government. • The case is pending before Hon. High Court in Guwahati for relief. • As per last hearing in the Court, it was advised to try to settle the case amicably, if possible .

Short Note on Capital Goods: • The plant was imported in 2009 for manufacturing of corrugated galvanized sheets. • The technique in 2009 to manufacture galvanized sheets was sheet to sheet basis i.e. every sheets was cut first and then corrugated one by one. There was no colour coating in process. While in present time, the process to manufacture galvanized sheet is continuous in which sheets are continuously processed, galavanized and corrugated and then cut one by one. There is colour coating in new process. • In old method, Zinc consumption is much more than current/latest process of galavnisation. It affects the costing of the product badly. • The Zinc consumption in old method during galvanizing process is very high compare to present technique. It is the reason of higher or abnormal costing with old plant which is not competitive in current market. • Quality of product in new method is also much better than old method. • Over all cost of the product in new method is much lesser than old method. •

The representative of the firm requested to export of noodles for equal or more value of existing export obligation by their majority partner, CG Foods India Pvt/ Ltd. M/s CG Foods India Pvt. Ltd. (CGFI) having 98% sharing in CG Galva India and it is FDI Company established in 2002. CGFI is manufacturing of Noodles & Snacks in India. It is an FDI company. CGFI is having 98% holding in partnership Firm CG Galva India. CGFI is running its manufacturing facilities in India in 6 locations in India for manufacturing of Noodles & Snacks in the brand name of "Wai Wai".

Our Request for Relief: •

• Allow us to transfer the EO (Based on actual duty saved) of Firm to its Partner M/s CG Foods India Pvt. Ltd. which is having 98% holding in the Firm, for export of Noodles & Snacks in the brand name of "Wai Wai".

• Allow us at least 3 years for fulfilling the EO .

Comments of EPCG Division were seen.

<u>**Decision**</u>: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.06 M/s.Richa Fashion (Rakhi Creations), {Bhanwarlal Choudhary, H.U.F.} Surat, Gujarat.
F.No.01/60/162/549AM21/PRC
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Waiver of Para 5.11.2 of HBP against EPCG authorization No. 5230000401 dated 31.03.2005.

Applicant Statement: This case was last considered in EPCG Committee meeting held on 05.06.2018 and Committee noted that the party seeks waiver from fulfilment of EO on the ground of "force majeure". The Committee deliberated upon the case and decided to reject the request as there is no provision for waiver of export obligation in the FTP.
Order of Court dated 13.03.2024 : "We therefore, direct respondent No.1 to decide the application made by the petitioner at Annexure A page 31 of the petition after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a period of four weeks from today and place the decision on record of this petition".
Copy of Order, Para-wise comments of EPCG, Application was also seen.

<u>**Decision:**</u> The committee went through the order passed by Hon'ble High Court of Ahmedabad and decided to call the firm for **Personal Hearing**.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No.07 M/s.Vivid Global Industries Limited, Mumbai
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00009067AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024

Subject: Request for Clubbing of Advance Authorization No. 0311006259 dated 18.01.2021 and Advance Authorization No.031102415 dated 26.09.2023.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that with reference to the above subject they have obtained the Two above Authorisations and fulfilled 88% export obligation against the Licence Number 0311006259 dated 18.08.2021 and balance 12% could not be fulfilled due to unavoidable circumstances. Summary of Utilization of Licence as below: First Import cleared: 01.10.2021 First Export Started: 20.01.2023 Last Import cleared: 17.11.2021 Last Export made : 11.01.2024. They have obtained the second Advance Authorisation 0311027415 dated 26.09.2023 details of summary as below: First Import cleared:01.12.2023 First Export Started: 01.11.2023 Last Export made: 29.01.2024 (within the EO period of Licence Number 0311006259 dated 18.08.2021.) They have cleared 6864 Kgs and balance Import Quantity 5022.96 Kgs is not cleared as excess import quantity 5022.96 Kgs to club with Licence Number 0311006259 dated 18.08.2021. The phenomena in global market there is lot of competition to avoid financial loss they are clubbing these 2 licences and request for condonation of delay of 36 Days. Hence they are requesting to allow clubbing of above mentioned authorizations.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.08 M/s United Poly Engineering Private Limited, Delhi.
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00009137AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0510407252 dated 19.01.2018.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that File No-HQRPRCAPPLY00171468AM22 Date: 18.03.2024 to PRC Committee requested for extension of PRC decision dtd. 21.06.2022 with respect to delayed submission of PRC Decision to regional authority beyond 30 days- against subject Authorisation That the request for extension of EO period was filed with DGFT(HQ) in August 2021 and they were waiting for the intimation from the DGFT HQ for a hearing in the matter. After waiting for more than 6 months, when they received no intimation from DGFT(HQ). Finally, when they searched the web site of DGFT in end August, 2022 with hope to find out the status of the matter, they found that the matter has been already decided and uploaded on 11.07.2022 wherein the required/sought relief had been granted by the PRC, allowing 30 days to approach RA. Thereafter, they immediately approached the regional authority with request to implement the PRC decision on 09.09.2022 which is a minor delay in approaching the RA of about 28 days beyond prescribed 30 days from the date of upload/publication. But the regional authority has not accepted the delayed submission. Hence they are requesting to allow condone the delay and re-consider the EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and decided to condone the delay of 28 days in approaching the RA against earlier PRC decision. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-CLA-New Delhi)

Case No.09 M/s VSVR Chems Private Limited, Chennai.
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00004344AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Re-credit/Refund of duty amount back against 2 MEIS scrip No.0419101232 dated 06.01.2022 and 3719017815 dated 11.03.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that import shipment cargo was wrongly received by them (rock salt) against the intended cargo of soda ash light and dense. Hence Tuticorin sea port customs had investigated the matter and issued order in original to refund the duty amounts back to the importer. Hence, MEIS 0419101232 and 3719017815 duty debit amounts to be re credited back as per the order in original of Tuticorin sea port customs Tuticorin. Hence they are requesting to Re-credit/Refund of duty amount back against 2 MEIS scrip No.0419101232 dated 06.01.2022 and 3719017815 dated 11.03.2022.

Comments of PC-3 were seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and it was decided to refer the issue to PC-3 Division for its resolution.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 division)

Case No.10 M/s Theon Pharmaceuticals Limited, Haryana.
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00007946AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Extension of Advance Authorization No. 3011002192 dated 30.05.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they had obtained above cited advance licence from the office of DGFT Ludhiana under Appendix 4j (2) import drug from unregistered sources and supplied the 1559020 tabs. (Sitagliptin tablet 100mg) to overseas buyer against their order. Due to unavoidable circumstance the buyer cancel the order of balance Qty. The export validation of advance licence was over in 05.12.2023. The unutilised imported material under this advance licence is laying with them. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension up to 30.09.2024 against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3011002192 dated 30.05.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Panipat)

Case No.11 M/s SMI Coated Products Private Limited, Mumbai
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00007936AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0311006961 dated 15.09.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are one of the largest exporter of Label from India and have obtained Advance Licence No 0311006961 dated 15.09.2021 from ADGFT Mumbai. Their Import validity was valid upto 15.09.2023. They have completed export obligation, however import / procurement against this authorisation is pending on time as their senior executive who was responsible for the tasks left the organisation without completing the necessary work hence the delay. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.12 M/s SMI Coated Products Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00007933AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0311013547 dated 01.04.2022
Applicant Statement:. The applicant stated that they are one of the largest exporter of Label from India and have obtained Advance Licence No 0311013547 dated 01.04.2022 from ADGFT Mumbai. Their Import validity was valid upto 01.04.2023. They have completed export obligation, however import / procurement against this authorisation is pending on time as their senior executive who was responsible for the tasks left the organisation without completing the necessary work hence the delay. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.13 M/s Mukka Proteins Limited, Karnataka
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00007941AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Extension of EOP of Advance Authorization No. 0711001292 dated 10.06.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that actual validity of EO was 10/12/2022. They could export only to the extent of 2700 Metric Tons. Further they had obtained 1st Extension from 10.12.2022 to 10.06.2023. However they could not complete the balance export obligation due to the unavailability of export order. Further they had obtained 2nd EO Extension from 10.06.2023 to 10.12.2023. In this extended period once again they could not export due to Un-availability of the export order. However, now they have obtained export order from M/s Spectra Hexa Feeds limited, DAG no 127, 185, 187, 188 & 190, Utholi, Shibalaya, Manikgonj, Bangladesh of 1000 Metric tons. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0711001292 dated 10.06.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No.14 M/s La-Gajjar Machineries Private Limited, Ahmedabad.

F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00007056AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 4 S/Bills.
This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.13/AM24 held on 31.08.2023 (Case No.47) wherein Committee rejected the case.
Applicant Statement: In this review application the applicant stated that they are the large exporter of Pumps under the brand of Varuna LGM. They could not complete MEIS application due to technical glitches on DGFT Website. They have not crossed the limit of MEIS incentive of Rs. 2 crores as mentioned in the Notification No.30 dated 01-09-2020 for the LEO period 01.09.2020 to 31.12.2020. It is an experience of all the industry that the online system have had server issues and they do not get the information as to when it gets start or shut down. The consignment was physically exported and realization made in FCN. Hence they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against 4 S/Bills.

Decision: The Committee reviewed and went through the justification furnished by the firm and discussed the case at length and found no merit in the request of the firm. Accordingly, it decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.13/AM24 held on 31.08.2023 (Case No.47).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.15 M/s Nikhil Adhesives Limited, Mumbai.
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00007955AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0311003812 dated 15.01.2021.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained the above authorization from RLA, Mumbai with initial Import validity up to 15.05.2022 (12 months). It has been further revalidated up to 15.05.2023 vide P.N. 16 dated 22.07.2021. They made the submission of Bond Waiver Letter application on 13.02.2023 post completion of Export Obligation vide Online Application File No. 03AE04013085AM23. The RLA had issued first discrepancy letter for submission of Non-Utilization Certificate from Customs. The Customs issued the Non-Utilization Certificate on 30.05.2023, wherein their Import Period had already expired. Accordingly, RLA has issued second discrepancy letter stating Licence is not valid. Since the Licence validity is already expired, they are unable to do import.Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation against subject authorization.

<u>Decision:</u> The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it decided to allow revalidation for a further period of 3 months from the date of endorsement against Advance Authorization No. 0311003812 dated 15.05.2021. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Vadodara)

Case No.16 M/s Exide Industries Limited, Kolkata.
F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY00007956AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0211000353 dated 02.03.2021.
This is review case of PRC Meeting No.30/AM24 held on 23.02.2024 (Case No.15) wherein Committee rejected the case.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that subject DFIA remain unutilized within its validity period, in view of the difficulties out of COVID-19 induced Country wise Lock Down announced by the Government as well as by various restriction imposed by the State Government time to time. The difficulties where further compounded by lesser movement of containers, high freight rates and significant increase in the cost of various Raw Material induced the high cost of manufacturing activities, hence the main Raw material Lead and Polypropylene could not be Imported. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of DFIA.

<u>Decision</u>: The Committee reviewed and went through the justification furnished by the firm and discussed the case at length and found no merit in the request of the firm. Accordingly, it decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No. 30/AM24 held on 23.02.2024 (case No.15).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.17 M/s PMR Mud Riggers India Private Limited, Pune
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007860AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation of Seven MEIS scrip.
This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.18/AM24 held on 20.10.2023(Case No.35) wherein Committee rejected the case.
Applicant Statement: In this review application the applicant stated that one of their employee handling the all DGFT related work died by heart attack and all the licenses were issued in the online system no physical courier received by DGFT. While they have an upcoming import then they come to know that their all scrips

were expired and only due to death of their employee. All the licenses validity was given a year only and earlier it was 2 years validity. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of seven MEIS scrips.

Decision: The committee went through the submission made by the applicant. After detailed discussion the Committee decided to maintain the rejection of earlier decision of PRC in its meeting No. 18/AM24 held on 20.10.2023(case No.35).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.18 M/s Arya Fash-Tex, Ahmedabad
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007928AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for relaxation in EPCG authorization no. 083003907 dated 28.10.2010.
This is review case of EPCG Committee 10th Meeting held on 09.02.2024 (Case No.47) wherein Committee reject the case.
Applicant Statement: In this review applicant the applicant stated that they have imported multi drive computerised machine for manufacturing of embroidery fabrics and readymade garments through third party exporter. Due to lack of policy knowledge and procedure, they have failed to amend their license within the stipulated time and hence they are approaching for amendment of export product. They have obtained Certificate of Amendment from Customs adding Supporting Manufacturer and EPCG Authorisation Number to said SBs. The ITCHS of embroidery readymade garments has not been endorsed on EPCG license and hence they are approaching PRC for relaxation and amendment of the same as their license is expired and RA Ahmedabad has directed them to approach PRC. Hence they are requesting to allow relaxation for addition/amendment of ITCHS for redemption of subject EPCG Authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.19 M/s Genus Power Infrastructures Limited, Rajasthan
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007196AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: To allow relaxation for submission of Appendix 22C against EPCG authorization no. 0530141672 dated 04.08.2006.

This is review case of PRC Meeting No.20/AM24 held on 17.11.2023 (Case No.49) wherein Committee rejected the case.

Applicant Statement: In this review applicant the applicant stated RA is asking for Appendix 22 C after 3 years after submission of Redemption application and reply to various objections raised from time to time, in their case main contractor is not able to provide Appendix 22C because he had supplied material to the ADB funded project along with installation of various Product and one to one correlation is not possible. They had submitted BRC in Appendix 22B along with Central Excise Certificate. However, they had also submitted Physical Export to discharge 100% Export obligation, but the first block time was expired and they had also not applied for extension of first block time as they had submitted redemption application. The RA did not accept the above facts and directed to approach PRC for relaxation form Appendix 22C FTP/HPB 8.2.4, as physical export is in the second block. Hence they are requesting to allow relaxation for submission of Appendix 22C against EPCG authorization no. 0530141672 dated 04.08.2006.

They had fulfilled first block 100% export obligation on 12 March 2013 and submitted our application for redemption by supplied Material Electronic Energy Meter, under deemed export to a ADB funded Project and goods were dispatch to Contractor, the contractor had installed the material according to project requirement instruction of Final customer MP Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Company Limited Jabalpur.

They are a manufacturer of Electronic Energy meters which were used in installation along with other material and the bill was submitted by the contractor according to contract terms. As the Electronic Energy meters supplied by them were installed at different location at different time and bills to MP Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Company Limited Jabalpur were submitted in many times it was not practically possible for our customer to correlate our invoice as payment receipted details from MP Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Company Limited Jabalpur were for entire work executed by him. Accordingly, the customer after supply of material to the ADB project and getting payment was not able to issue the Appendix 22C.

They had submitted redemption application along with BRC & Project authority certificate copy enclosed for ready reference , on requirement the sales tax form were also submitted as a proof of supply was also submitted along with store receipt and LR copies. During examination after filling application the process many objections were raised and replied by us including submission of Statement of Invoices certified by Central Excise.

After a long process of examination from 12 March 2013 to 29th Feb 2016 The Officer has asked for Appendix 22 C Copy enclosed vide letter dated 29/2/2016 sir raise various objection after so many time is not correct according to the procedure prescribed the copy of letter is enclosed .

Till received of the query for Appendix 22 C the time of First block was expired however we had immediately completed the export by using other shipping bills and had again submitted revised application with fresh direct export on dated 14/16 June 2016. As they were not aware that the Deemed export submitted in redemption with Project authority certificate & BRC will not be considered as the Appendix 22 C, were not submitted we had not applied for EOP extension of first block. That even after submission of 200% export obligation the officers vide letter 29th Sept. 2016 direct to approach PRC /EPCG Committee for relaxation in this matter. We are regularly following up for decision and relaxation based on our request dated 17/10/2016 &17/10/2017 to PRC, we were informed that the JT DGFT CLA is competent to take decisions as per public notice No. 35 & 36 dated 25th Oct. 2017. We had started to approach the CLA office, but the officer was just giving the reply that we will examine the file and do needful, wait. Sir the customs authorities are pressing hard to produce EODC, as soon as possible against the above EPCG license.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that the firm is facing difficulty beyond their control. Accordingly, it decided to accede to the request and relax the procedure to allow for submission of Appendix 22B against EPCG authorization no. 0530141672 dated 04.08.2006 for consideration of RA for closure purpose in lieu of Appendix 22C. RA may check that supplies made were eligible for deemed export benefits before implementing the decision of the Committee. No other relaxation was allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- CLA-New Delhi)

Case No.20 M/s Kalp Impex, Jalgaon
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009079AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for removal of AU Condition of Import License 0550001577 dated 20.01.2009.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that in view of minutes of inter ministerial committee meeting dt. 29.04.2003 & PN. 47 dt. 18.05.2011 as well as order of Mumbai High Court dt. 21/05/2021 read with observation of Telangana High Court the request of removal of AU condition of license has complete merit. PRC has considered the said issue in its meeting no 21/AM 2022 dt 10-03-2022 and found merits in the contention based on several aspects including Minutes of Inter Ministerial Meeting dt 29-04-2003 and acceded to the request of the applicants Shah Nanji Nagsi Exports Pvt Ltd. Hence they are requesting to allow removal of AU condition against subject license.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request for removal of AU Condition.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 21 M/s Ratna Nico Chem Private Limited, Vadodara.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008974M24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for closure of Advance Authorization No. 3410044197 dated 01.01.2018
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied for AA for deemed export but the RLA Baroda has issued the AA under C.N no. 18/2015. They have carried out the import under the said notification and have fulfilled the EO against the import made via deemed export. Based on the above fact RLA Baroda is not considering their case for closure. They have fulfilled the EO against import made and condone import made against C.N no 18/2015 and instruct the RLA Baroda. Hence they are requesting to allow closure of above mentioned authorization.

Decision: Deferred.

Case No.22 M/s Sara Sae Private Limited, Dehradun.

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009068AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject :Request for Extension of Advance Authorization No. 6110001393 dated 5.1.2017.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are manufacturer Exporter of Oil Field equipment and parts, exported to worldwide. At present, they had exported the consignment to the customer vide Invoice No.2324-0202000327 Shipping Bill No.5296213 dated 10.11.2023 against the Advance authorisation. In Past, they were unable to send the items as soon as the customer asked due to the downturn in the oil business and the corona virus, and as a result, the customer's order was placed on hold. As of right now, they have exported the item against the Advance authorization to the customer. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension up to 15.11.2023 against subject authorization for regularization purpose.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 23 M/s Thermosol Glass Private Limited, Ahmedabad
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008967AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 heldon04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Extension of EPCG Authorization No. 0830004636 dated 19.01.2012
This is review case of PRC Meeting No.06/AM24 held on 19.06.2023 (Case No.13) wherein Committee reject the case.
Applicant Statement: In the review application the applicant stated that they have successfully received two orders for supply of PR3 Solar Parabolic Mirrors and order. Their manufacturing facility is well maintained and in state of ready to produce. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.
ANF 2D reflecting export position was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to maintain the rejection as in earlier decision of PRC in it's meeting No. 08/AM23 held on 28.06.2022 (case No.19). RA may take further necessary action in the matter.

(Action: Applicant/ RA Ahmedabad)

Case No. 24 M/s Balaji Heavy Lifters Private Limited, Gujarat
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009061AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Extension of EPCG Authorization No. 3730000222 dated 1.7.2014
This is a review case of EPCG Committee Meeting held on 30.05.2023 (Case No.39) wherein Committee to approach RA for regularising the case under the Amnesty Scheme notified vide PN No.02/2023 dated 02.04.2023.
Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that their request for extension was already decided in the Meeting dated 30.05.2023 and directed RA to consider request for the 2nd extension i.e. 8 years to 10 years on the merit of submission of installation certificate on stipulated time. While they have approach the PRC for the extension beyond the 8 year to 10 years which comes to extension till 01.07.2024. However, as per PN No.67 export obligation period is expiring between 1st Feb. 2020 to 31st July, 2020. Hence they are eligible for 6 months extension which is

automatically granted by the system. They are eligible for the extension till 01.01.2025. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension up to 30.06.2025 against subject EPCG authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 25 M/s Ratnamani Metal and Tubes Limited, Ahmedabad.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009183AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation/amendment/enhancement of Advance Authorization No. 0811004447 dt. 22.3.2022.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have made request for the Amendment to RA Ahmedabad for the Enhancement / Re-Fixation of Export/Import Qty and Value but the same is rejected under the reason that export made under the Suspended SION C-791. Their First Export was made on 22.03.2022 ie on the same day of Licence issue date and last Export on 21.09.2023 ie with in EO Period of 18 Months. Their Major Export 91.73% completed before SION suspended. Only 8.27% EO completed after Public Notice 19 of SION Suspension. They have continued to export under the AA till the EO Period to regularise the import already made under Licence. They have made 90% of actual Import before SION Suspended, and to regularise the Import already made it is necessary to export under the AA even after the SION suspended SION was suspended with immediate effect vide PN 19 , dt 27.07.2022 and it is not clarified in the Public Notice that export / Import is not permissible under the existing AA already issued under SION C-791. They have made Export /Import as per the Terms and conditions stipulated under the AA with in EO Period and are not asking for EO period extension under the suspended SION, they are requesting for the Enhancement /Re-Fixation of Qty/Value as per actual export made under the AA. Hence they are requesting to regularise the export made under the AA, and issue amendment /Enhancement of Export /Import Qty and Value as per the Actual Export Made and revalidation for six Months from the date of endorsement so, that they can import the balance qty as per the actual export made after re-fixation/enhancement.

Decision: The committee went through the statement made by the firm in its application and noted that the facts of the case have not been clearly specified by the firm and hence decided to call the firm for **Personal Hearing**.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No. 26 M/s Medreich Limited, Bengaluru.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008891AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request forExtension of Advance Authorization No. 0711001543 dated 26.7.2021
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained Advance Authorization No.0711001543/26.07.2021 in order to export Tadalafil 5mg/10mg Tablets. Due to Covid and other supply related issues they are unable to export in the 24 months period from the date of license. They have received 7.5 KGs raw material only from the supplier out of 50 KGs. They have exported only 2.961 KGs out of receipt of 7.5 KGs and the balance quantity of 4.539 KGs yet to be exported. Hence, they are requesting to allow EO period upto 26.07.2024 (36 months) in order to complete the balance export obligation.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 071100543 dated 26.1.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No. 27 M/s Prayag Polytech Private Limited, Gurugram.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008910AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Extension of Advance Authorization No. 0511000262 dated 21.1.2020.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that due to worldwide recession arise after covid-19 and effect of the expansion and multifold hikes in ocean freight, which became all time high and add increased freight costs making it impossible to complete in global market which was already hampered by recession. They have to look for new business globally instead of already settled customers to survive. As they are trying to get new order and regaining the lost business, export obligation period for the advance authorisation had expired on 21/12/2022. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 28 M/s R R Kabel Limited, Mumbai.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009117AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310821223 dated 24.1.2018.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they they have not fulfilled export Obligation under the Advance Authorization. Due to COVID-19, all over world the Market has slowed down. They could complete the Export order received from the foreign buyer against the export product due to lockdown and effect non completion of Export Obligation under Advance Authorization. Hence they are requesting to allow six month EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.29 M/s. Kumar Brothers Co. Delhi
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008972AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for disbursal of past incentives viz. MEIS/ROSL/RoSCTL as per judgement dated 11.09.2023 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that the claims could not be applied/released to them because of the name OL of their firm was put under High RIsky Exporters list vide circular No. 131/1/2020-GST dt 23.01.2020 issued by Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs. Therefore, they approached Hon'ble Delhi High court for giving necessary relief so as to claim all due benefits, and a stay order dated 29.12.2021 was granted with the following orders " IT IS MADE CLEAR THAT IN CASE THE PEIITIONER SUCCEEDS IN THE WRIT PETITION, CIRCULAR DATED 02.11.2021 SHALL NOT COME IN THE WAY OF PETITIONER IN SEEKING RELEASE OF EXPORT INCENTIVES, TO WHICH IT LAYS A CIAIM IN THE PRESENT PETITION". During the proceedings in the Hon'ble High Court the name was removed from the list of High Risky Exporters from 1.1.2021 the data of their S/Bills were reflected on ICEGATE Portal and accordingly they claimed benefits against all those S/Bills. Benefits due on exports against Shipping Bills prior to 01.01-2021 have not yet been granted by the Addl- DGFT, CLA, New Delhi.

Since, now there is no portal available on DGFT site to claim the benefits against listed Shipping bills, they are unable to claim the benefits against said Shipping Bills. Hence they are requesting to allow benefits of MEIS scrip.

Earlier comments of PC-3 were seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 30 M/s. Dhwani Polyprints Private Limited,Mumbai.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007966AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation of AA No. 0311010679 dt. 19.01.2022.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are one of the leading manufacturers and exporters of innovative packaging products like Security bags, Tamper evident bags, Courier bags and Cash transit bags. Their Import validity was valid upto 19.01.2024 and have completed 100% export obligation, however import / procurement against this authorisation is pending on time. The license has been redeemed by Addl. Director General of Foreign Trade, Mumbai on 10.05.2023and they had tried to submit online revalidate for Imports on DGFT portal but its shown as CLOSED, hence unable to revalidate the same. DGFT-RA, Mumbai, has expressed their inability to revalidate the license. Due to this they are already feeling pressure on pricing as well margins and overall difficulties in maintaining the existing buyers. Further, due to prevailing geo-political atmosphere created by Ukraine crisis, prices of raw materials, are shooting up with increasing volatility. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation of subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 31 M/s. Dhwani Polyprints Private Limited, Mumbai.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008060AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation of AA No. 0311013644 dt. 05.04.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are one of the leading manufacturers and exporters of innovative packaging products like Security bags, Tamper evident bags, Courier bags and Cash transit bags. Their Import validity was valid upto 05.04.2024 and have completed 100% export obligation, however import / procurement against this authorisation is pending on time. The license has been redeemed by Addl. Director General of Foreign Trade, Mumbai on 25.04.2023 and they had tried to submit online revalidate for Imports on DGFT portal but its shown as CLOSED, hence unable to revalidate the same. DGFT-RA, Mumbai, has expressed their inability to revalidate the license. Due to this they are already feeling pressure on pricing as well margins and overall difficulties in maintaining the existing buyers. Further, due to prevailing geo-political atmosphere created by Ukraine crisis, prices of raw materials, are shooting up with increasing volatility. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation of subject authorization.

<u>**Decision**</u>: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 32 M/s. Dhwani Polyprints Private Limited,Mumbai.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008085AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation of AA No. 0311007799 dt. 21.10.2021.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are one of the leading manufacturers and exporters of innovative packaging products like Security bags, Tamper evident bags, Courier bags and Cash transit bags. Their Import validity was valid upto 21.10.2023 and have completed 100% export obligation, however import / procurement against this authorization is pending on time. The license has been redeemed by Addl. Director General of Foreign Trade, Mumbai on 26.04.2023 and they had tried to submit online revalidate for Imports on DGFT portal but its shown as CLOSED, hence unable to revalidate the same. DGFT-RA, Mumbai, has expressed their inability to revalidate the license. Due to this they are already feeling pressure on pricing as well margins and overall difficulties in maintaining the existing buyers. Further, due to prevailing geo-political atmosphere created by Ukraine crisis, prices of raw materials, are shooting up with increasing volatility. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation of subject authorization

<u>**Decision**</u>: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 33 M/s. Dhwani Polyprints Private Limited,Mumbai.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008081AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation of AA No. 0311006664 dt. 03.09.2021.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are one of the leading manufacturers and exporters of innovative packaging products like Security bags, Tamper evident bags, Courier bags and Cash transit bags. Their Import validity was valid upto 03.09.2023 and have completed 100% export obligation, however import / procurement against this authorization is pending on time. The license has been redeemed by Addl. Director General of Foreign Trade, Mumbai on 21.04.2023 and they had tried to submit online revalidate for Imports on DGFT portal but its shown as CLOSED, hence unable to revalidate the same. DGFT-RA, Mumbai, has expressed their inability to revalidate the license. Due to this they are already feeling pressure on pricing as well margins and overall difficulties in maintaining the existing buyers. Further, due to prevailing geo-political atmosphere created by Ukraine crisis, prices of raw materials, are shooting up with increasing volatility. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation of subject authorization

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 34 M/s. Dhwani Polyprints Private Limited,Mumbai.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008080AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for Revalidation of AA No. 0311009603 dt. 17.12.2021.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are one of the leading manufacturers and exporters of innovative packaging products like Security bags, Tamper evident bags, Courier bags and Cash transit bags. Their Import validity was valid upto 17.12.2023 and have completed 100% export obligation, however import / procurement against this authorization is pending on time. The license has been redeemed by Addl. Director General of Foreign Trade, Mumbai on 21.04.2023 and they had tried to submit online revalidate for Imports on DGFT portal but its shown as CLOSED, hence unable to revalidate the same. DGFT-RA, Mumbai, has expressed their inability to revalidate the license. Due to this they are already feeling pressure on pricing as well margins and overall difficulties in maintaining the

existing buyers. Further, due to prevailing geo-political atmosphere created by Ukraine crisis, prices of raw materials, are shooting up with increasing volatility. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation of subject authorization

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 35 M/s Sara Sae Private Limited, Dehradun.

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009069AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject :Request for Extension of Advance Authorization No. 6110001549 dated 10.01.2018.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are manufacturer Exporter of Oil Field equipment and parts, exported to worldwide and are almost ready to export the product against the Advance authorization. In the past, the oil business downturn and the Corona pandemic prevented them from exporting the goods on time as requested by the customer, and as a result of the delay, the customer put the order on hold. Now the customer has ready to accept the order and advised to export within the time. The Corona Disaster severely impacted exports and caused the business to cease or slow down. The DGFT was granted a 21-month relaxation due to Corona penadamic, the entire licensing year was 61 months till date. The actual licensing period is limited to 40 months. The Customer once again pressurized to them for export the item within time or they cancel the order. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension up to 31.06.2024 against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 36 M/s. Maxmed Life Sciences Private Limited, Delhi.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008619AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP of Advance Authorization No.0511000821 dated 18.01.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that challenges that their company has faced due to the unprecedented impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on global trade and after Russia and Ukraine war upset to them for their already develop export market Further by mistake they had not mentioned license no in the S/Bills in EOP period. They must required extension in EOP period 31.10.2024 against AA No 0511000821 dt 18.01.2021. Their export order cancelled and raw material kept with them in raw form. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0511000821 dated 18.01.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-CLA, New Delhi)

Case No. 37 M/s.ITC Limited, Chennai.

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007835AM24

Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 8 shipping bills for which E-BRC was delayed by Bank.

This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.02/AM23 held on 13.04.2022 (Case No.37) wherein Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed MEIS benefit against above mentioned 8 shipping bills without any late cut.

Applicant Statement: In this application they have stated that they have approached PRC for condonation of delay to apply for MEIS applications as the process got delayed due to non-issuance of BRCs by banks & non-upload of shipping bills in GDFT portal by Customs department. PRC was kind enough to grant permission to apply for MEIS without payment of late cut fee. Accordingly they had tried in DGFT portal and faced the following issues : Some of the shipping bills are not appearing in DGFT portal. In case of some shipping bills, MEIS benefit value is appearing as "zero" in the DGFT portal. Due to the above, they were unable to claim the MEIS benefit. They have been following up the matter with DGFT office and no solution is suggested till date. Hence they are requesting to allow the S/Bills to be uploaded manually without applying any late cut fee for claim benefit of MEIS.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and noted that manual uploading is not allowed. The Committee decided to refer the issue to PC-3 Division to attempt for its resolution.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 division)

Case No. 38 M/s. Padmini VNA Mechatronics Limited, Gurugram.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007868AM24
Meeting No. 01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for claim of MEIS benefits.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have made exports vide S/Bill during FY 2020-21 (01.04.2020 to 31.08.2020) and all the overseaspayment had been realized from Overseas Buyers on time, but their Bank had not uploaded E-BRCs on time and all the Overseas Payments had been realized within in time, but due to some circumstances, their Bank has not uploaded E-BRCs timely All the S/Bills the Bank uploaded the E-BRCs after expiry of the last date to apply for the MEIS, even though they had realized the payment much before and within time only. Hence they are requesting to allow MEIS benefits of the above mentioned period.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to delay in uploading the BRC, the firm may have faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, the Committee decided to allow MEIS benefit only against those shipping bills whose realization has happened within time and e-BRCs have been uploaded by the bank after stipulated time. It also decided that no cut would be imposed on the entitlement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA/PC-3 Division for necessary updation)

Case No.39 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00002730AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for amendment of license from self – ratification scheme as per para 4.07 A of HBP to self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP advance in authorisation No. 0311009117 dated 02.12.2021.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied and obtained Licence No. 0311009117 dated 02.12.2021 under Self Ratification Scheme. License issued as per para 4.07A have to comply with pre-import condition. They are not able to comply / fulfill the pre-import condition in the license, hence they are applying to the PRC to kindly allow to amend the license from self-ratification scheme as per

para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP. They are submitting declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No. 1/AM2000 dt. 07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay customs duty and interest in case norms are rejected or reduced against the Advance License. They have already fulfilled the export obligation and such amendment if accepted will enable them to regularize the license as pre import condition will not be applicable to the license under self-declaration scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment of license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared Authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP.

Report of RA, Mumbai was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0311009117 dated 02.12.2021 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- Mumbai/NC)

Case No.40 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00002739AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for amendment of license from self – ratification scheme as per para 4.07 A of HBP to self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP in Advance Authorization No. 0311008775 dated 23.11.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied and obtained Licence No.0311008775 dated 23.11.2021 under Self Ratification Scheme. License issued as per para 4.07A have to comply with pre-import condition. They are not able to comply / fulfill the pre-import condition in the license, hence they are applying to the PRC to kindly allow to amend the license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP. They are submitting declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No. 1/AM2000 dt. 07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay customs duty and interest in case norms are rejected or reduced against the Advance License. They have already fulfilled the export obligation and such amendment if accepted will enable them to regularize the license as pre import condition will not be applicable to the license under self-declaration scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment of license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared Authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP.
Report of RA, Mumbai was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0311008775 dated 23.11.2021 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- Mumbai/NC)

Case No. 41 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00002740AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for amendment of license from self – ratification scheme as per para 4.07 A of HBP to self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP in 0311000450 dated 25.02.2021.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied and obtained Licence No.0311000450 dated 25.02.2021 under Self Ratification Scheme. License issued as per para 4.07A have to comply with pre-import condition. They are not able to comply / fulfill the pre-import condition in the license, hence they are applying to the PRC to kindly allow to amend the license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP. They are submitting declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No. 1/AM2000 dt. 07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay customs duty and interest in case norms are rejected or reduced against the Advance License. They have already fulfilled the export obligation and such amendment if accepted will enable them to regularize the license as pre import condition will not be applicable to the license under self-declaration scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment of license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared Authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP
Report of RA, Mumbai was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0311000450 dated 25.02.2021 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- Mumbai/NC)

Case No. 42 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00005747AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for amendment of license from self – ratification scheme as per para 4.07 A of HBP to self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP in 0311008817 dated 24.11.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied and obtained Licence No.0311008817 dated 24.11.2021 under Self Ratification Scheme. License issued as per para 4.07A have to comply with pre-import condition. They are not able to comply / fulfill the pre-import condition in the license, hence they are applying to the PRC to kindly allow to amend the license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP. They are submitting declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No. 1/AM2000 dt. 07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay customs duty and interest in case norms are rejected or reduced against the Advance License. They have already fulfilled the export obligation and such amendment if accepted will enable them to regularize the license as pre import condition will not be applicable to the license under self-declaration scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment of license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared Authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP.
Report of RA, Mumbai was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0311008817 dated 24.11.2021 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- Mumbai/NC)

Case No. 43 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00005746AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for amendment of license from self – ratification scheme as per para 4.07 A of HBP to self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP of AA no. 0311008815 dated 24.11.2021
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied and obtained Licence No.0311008815 dated 24.11.2021 under Self Ratification Scheme. License issued as per para 4.07A have to comply with pre-import condition. They are not able to comply / fulfill the pre-import condition in the license, hence they are applying to the PRC to kindly allow to amend the license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP. They are

submitting declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No. 1/AM2000 dt. 07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay customs duty and interest in case norms are rejected or reduced against the Advance License. They have already fulfilled the export obligation and such amendment if accepted will enable them to regularize the license as pre import condition will not be applicable to the license under self-declaration scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment of license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared Authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP.

Report of RA, Mumbai was seen.

<u>Decision</u>: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0311008815 dated 24.11.2021 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- Mumbai/NC)

Case No. 44 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00002736AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for amendment of license from self – ratification scheme as per para 4.07 A of HBP to self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP of AA no. 0311018393 dated 06.10.2022

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied and obtained Licence No.0311008393 dated 06.10.2022 under Self Ratification Scheme. License issued as per para 4.07A have to comply with pre-import condition. They are not able to comply / fulfill the pre-import condition in the license, hence they are applying to the PRC to kindly allow to amend the license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP. They are submitting declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No. 1/AM2000 dt. 07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay customs duty and interest in case norms are rejected or reduced against the Advance License. They have already fulfilled the export obligation and such amendment if accepted will enable them to regularize the license as pre import condition will not be applicable to the license under self-declaration scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment of license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared Authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP.

Report of RA, Mumbai was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0311018393 dated 06.10.2022 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- Mumbai/NC)

Case No. 45 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Mumbai
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00002732AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: Request for amendment of license from self – ratification scheme as per para 4.07 A of HBP to self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP of AA no. 0311008816 dated 24.11.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have applied and obtained Licence No.0311008816 dated 24.11.2021 under Self Ratification Scheme. License issued as per para 4.07A have to comply with pre-import condition. They are not able to comply / fulfill the pre-import condition in the license, hence they are applying to the PRC to kindly allow to amend the license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP. They are submitting declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No. 1/AM2000 dt. 07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay customs duty and interest in case norms are rejected or reduced against the Advance License. They have already fulfilled the export obligation and such amendment if accepted will enable them to regularize the license as pre import condition will not be applicable to the license under self-declaration scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment of license from self-ratification scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self-Declared Authorization as per para 4.07 of HBP.

Report of RA, Mumbai was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0311008816 dated 24.11.2021 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA- Mumbai/NC)

Case No. 46 M/s. Harimohan Agro Industries, Jalgaon
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009120AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: To remove AU condition from Import License No.0550001826 dated 05.01.2010.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that in view of minutes of inter Ministerial Committee Meeting dt. 29.04.2003 & PN. 47 dt. 18.05.2011 as well as order of Mumbai High Court dt. 21/05/2021 read with observation of Telangana High court the request of removal of AU condition of license has complete merit. PRC has considered the said issue in its Meeting No. 21/AM 2022 dt 10-03-2022 and found merits in the contention based on several aspects including Minutes of Inter Ministerial Meeting dt 29-04-2003 and acceded to the request of the applicants Shah Nanji Nagsi Exports Pvt Ltd. Hence they are requesting to allow removal of AU condition from Import License No.0550001826 dated 05.01.2010.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 47 M/s. Jawahar Lal & Sons, Indore, MP
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008951AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: To remove AU condition from Import License No.0550001614 dated 06.01.2009.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that in view of minutes of inter Ministerial Committee Meeting dt. 29.04.2003 & PN. 47 dt. 18.05.2011 as well as order of Mumbai High Court dt. 21/05/2021 read with observation of Telangana High court the request of removal of AU condition of license has complete merit. PRC has considered the said issue in its Meeting No. 21/AM 2022 dt 10-03-2022 and found merits in the contention based on several aspects including Minutes of Inter Ministerial Meeting dt 29-04-2003 and acceded to the request of the applicants Shah Nanji Nagsi Exports Pvt Ltd. Hence they are requesting to allow removal of AU condition from Import License No.0550001614 dated 06.01.2009.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 48 M/s. Jawahar Exim Limited, Thane.
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008952AM24
Meeting No.01AM25 held on 04.04.2024
Subject: To remove AU condition from Import License No.0550001575 dated 20.01.2009.
Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that in view of minutes of inter Ministerial Committee Meeting dt. 29.04.2003 & PN. 47 dt. 18.05.2011 as well as order of Mumbai High Court dt. 21/05/2021 read with observation of Telangana High court the request of removal of AU condition of license has complete merit. PRC has considered the said issue in its Meeting No. 21/AM 2022 dt 10-03-2022 and found merits in the contention based on several aspects including Minutes of Inter Ministerial Meeting dt 29-04-2003 and acceded to the request of the applicants Shah Nanji Nagsi Exports Pvt Ltd. Hence they are requesting to allow removal of AU condition from Import License No.0550001575 dated 20.01.2009.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 49 **M/s. Thermosol Glass Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad**
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008966AM24
Meeting No.01/AM25 held on 04.04.2024.
Subject: Extension in EOP against EPCG Authorization No.0830004541 dated 30.11.2011.

This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.06/AM24 held on 19.06.2023 (Case No.12) wherein Committee rejected the case.

Applicant Statement: In this review application the applicant stated that their company have successfully received two orders for supply of RP3 Solar Parabolic Mirrors. Their manufacturing facility is well maintained and in state of ready to produce. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.
ANF 2D reflecting export position was seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant. After detailed discussion the Committee decided to maintain the rejection as in earlier decision of PRC in it's meeting No. 06/AM24 held on 19.06.2023 (case No.12). RA may take further necessary action in the matter.

(Action: Applicant/RA Ahmedabad)

Case No. 50 M/s. Thermosol Glass Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad
F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008967AM24
Meeting No.01/AM25 held on 04.04.2024.
Subject: Extension in EOP against EPCG Authorization No.0830004636 dated 19.01.2012.

This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.06/AM24 held on 19.06.2023 (Case No.13) wherein Committee reject the case.
Applicant Statement: In this review application the applicant stated that their company have successfully received two orders for supply of RP3 Solar Parabolic Mirrors. Their manufacturing facility is well maintained and in state of ready to produce. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.
ANF 2D reflecting export position was seen.

Decision: The committee went through the submission made by the applicant. After detailed discussion the Committee decided to maintain the rejection as in earlier decision of PRC in it's meeting No. 06/AM24 held on 19.06.2023 (case No.13). RA may take further necessary action in the matter.

(Action: Applicant/RA Ahmedabad)